

REMARKS


Paragraph 290 of the Specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. and a marked-up version of paragraph 290 showing the changes made is attached hereto. New claims 142-197 have been added by this amendment for your consideration.

Enclosed is a Patent Application Fee Determination Record and a check in the amount of \$1,344.00 for the additional claim fees. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to the Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue Deposit Account No. 10-1202.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES, DAY, REAVIS & POGUE

Dated: December 4, 2001



Mark V. Campagna
Reg. No. 42,380
Attorneys for the Applicants
Jones, Day Reavis & Pogue
77 W. Wacker Dr.
Chicago, IL 60601-1692

MARKED -UP VERSION SHOWING CHANGES MADE

290. Therefore, a better option is to add a postamble to the FLP transmission, as shown in FIG. 37A. The tag 14 can then read the data portion of the [CLP] FLP, and if a response is required, turn ON the PLL, then verify the CRC, and continue if it is good. Otherwise, the tag 14 can turn the PLL OFF if it determines that the CRC is bad. Reading the data before verifying the CRC allows the PLL to settle while the remainder of the FLP (CRC and postamble) is being received and read. Because the tag 14 only enables the PLL after examining a portion of the FLP, the amount of time the tag PLL is ON is minimized. Therefore, packet interleaving in this fashion preserves tag battery power by minimizing the amount of time the PLL is ON when no valid FLPs that require a response are present (which could be a long period of time in the case of a fixed gate reader).